A REVIEW OF THE STATE OF THE BRITISH NATION.

Thursday, November 17. 1709.

I Have been stating the Case of Persecution in *Scotland*, *so much clamour'd at here*, and I have, as plainly and briefly as I can, put that Matter in a true Light—I expect large Cavils at this Attempt, but I shall take no Notice of them at all, unless they please to come to a fair and calm Debate of what is stated as the Question—But shall answer in the Words of a grave Prelate——*If they talk of such and such Things, as have no Relation to this—I shall give no Answer.*

But I know, we shall have another Objection here, *(viz.) That the meer Deposing Episcopacy is self is Persecution.* And this would require a long Discourse—— But, *as I am speaking chiefly to the Church of* England *in this Case*, I am very willing to make her a Judge—and presume, it will be *arguing ad hominem* to say, (tho' I do not lay the Stress here neither).

That Deposing *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, and Deposing *Popery* in *England*, stand in many Cases upon the same Foot—and the Church of *Scotland* has offer'd little or no Violence to the *Episcopal* People in *Scotland*, but what the Church of *England* has offer'd to the *Roman Catholicks* in *England*—— Now, tho' in general this would be no Argument, and therefore let no Man mistake me, yet 'tis a Reason in this Case, why the Church of *England*, *above all other*, ought not to charge the Church of *Scotland* with Persecution in that Particular—— But to go no further,

further; the Church of *Scotland* did not immediately pull down *Episcopacy*—*I mean, the Church abstractly consider'd in her Ecclesiastical Circumstances*——But it was done by the Government of *Scotland*, the Body of the People, I mean the Parliament, before the *Presbyterian* Church was re-establish'd—And it is evident, *Episcopacy* was turn'd out of *Scotland* not as a Thing establish'd, but *as an Intruder upon the Establish'd Religion*, which *Scotland* had from the very Reformation embrac'd, which they had sworn in their National Covenant to maintain, and which by Law it was their Right to restore; in short, *Episcopacy* was turn'd out as a Man, who has had his Estate taken from him by Oppression, *recovers his Right by Law*, and then dispossesses the wrongful Incroacher or Invader, and enters upon his own.

Universal History will allow, That the *Scots* reform'd first into the *Geneva Model* of Government by *Presbyters*, by the Agency of the famous *John Knox*, and others; and that they had no *Episcopacy* in their first Establishment at all, nor can all the Labour that has been spent to make the *Superintendents*, who were sent into the several Parts of the Kingdom to settle Ecclesiastick Affairs, *look like* Bishops——— For this Truth will for ever supersede that Suggestion, (*viz.*) That these *Superintendents*, tho' vested with Power over the Ministers they went to visit—yet *receiv'd that Power from*, and exercis'd it *in Subordination* to the general Assembly of the *Presbyterian* Church—and were often *call'd to an Account*, censur'd, and remov'd by the Synods, *nay, and some say, even by private Presbyteries*. See *Calderwood*'s History of the Church of *Scotland*.

Episcopacy in *Scotland* being thus suppos'd an Invader and Spoiler, the Revolution did no more than take from them their *Usurp'd Authority*, cause them to disgorge what they had most unjustly devour'd, and the Invader having thus been turn'd out, the right Owners of the House came, and took Possession of their own. *And this can by no means be call'd Persecution.*

My second Enquiry is upon a new Dispute, and I think admits of no Difficulties in Matters of Law, *whatever it may in Matters of Conscience*,———, *Viz.* Whether *the Deposed Exauctorate Bishops have Power left to Ordain Ministers?*———Indeed, I rather place the Question here, Whether *such Preachers as shall be licens'd or ordain'd by the Exauctorate Bishops, ought to be esteem'd as Ministers*, especially *in that Church which has so depos'd them?* This being the present Debate, it rather respects the Civil, than Ecclesiastick Part of the Question.

It seems to me highly absurd, That the Church of *England* should receive as a Minister among them, a Man ordain'd BY HIM WHOM they will not own or receive as a Minister of their Church——— Nor indeed do I know, that the Church of *England* has at all admitted this Absurdity among them. The Thing is only started in *Scotland*, *to beget new Broils* on that Head, and it seems still more absurd, that the *Nonjurant* Bishops in *Scotland* should have Power to ordain a Minister of the Church of *England*.

But to support this Absurdity, a *worse is started* among us, (*viz.*) That the *Episcopal* Church of *Scotland* is incorporated into the Church of *England* by the UNION. And this is the Reason of my third Enquiry, *Viz.*

Whether the Episcopal *Church of* Scotland, *and the present Establish'd Church of* England *are at all of Kin, or not?* This Enquiry, if it be directly trac'd, will lead to a new Question, (*viz.*) What is to be meant by the Church of *England*—*I mean in this Question only*——— And therefore I shall answer it both Ways very briefly.

If by the Church of *England* we mean the Church *as now Establish'd*, or rather recogniz'd by the Revolution—and now receiv'd and acknowledg'd by the Queen and Parliament, *then indeed*, this pretended Incorporation is an Absurdity—and there is no more any such thing, than there is an Incorporation between GOD and *Baal*; for the Church of *England*, *so understood*, has spu'd the other out as *Illegal*, has rejected her as *Jacobite*, and has joyn'd in and consented to by the UNION, the Establishment of the *Presbyterian* Church in her Stead; and upon her Ruins as the

true

Protestant Religion and Establish'd National Church of *Scotland*, (*vide*) the Act of UNION; and from this Stipulation, She (the Church of *England*) her self cannot go back——But if on the other hand, by the *Church* of *England* is to be understood the *Dodwellian Jacobite Faction of the Church*, who refuse to own, either the Religious or Civil Establishment now reigning in *Britain*, esteeming the QUEEN an Usurper, the Revolution a Rebellion, and the Church of *England* Schismatical——If thus they understand the Church of *England*, then they and the *Episcopal* Church of *Scotland* may, for ought I know, be *incorporated* into each other, and may be esteem'd *One Body—and they are welcome to be so accountable.* But how this is done by the UNION, remains for those *Gentlemen*, who pretend to it, to make *out*.

I think, I need not descend to many Arguments in this Case; the Thing is evident; the *Episcopal Dissenters* in *Scotland* being entirely *Jacobite* at *this Time*, cannot be said to incorporate with the Church of *England*, who acknowledge Queen ANNE, because they reject her as Schismatical and Apostate——And that they can reject her, and be incorporated into her at the same time, seems impracticable and absurd.

It remains to enquire, Whether the *Episcopacy* and the *English* Liturgy may not be tolerated in *Scotland*——And here I shall wave the various Arguments about the Necessity and Obligation which lies on all Christians to pay Reverence to Conscience, in order to give all possible Liberty to Religious Opinions—— But I shall lay the Stress of my present arguing another Way.

First speaking of *Scotland*, we are to distinguish between tolerating of *Episcopacy*, and tolerating of *Jacobitism*——And if this be distinguish'd right here, we shall have little need of the Question at all—— And in the Name of the *Scots*, I may very well say to the Church of *England*—Gentlemen, when *you please* to tolerate *Jacobitism* by Law in *England*, *we will consider of* tolerating *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*—And this Way of arguing seems very just, because if you please to abstract *Jacobitism* from *Episcopacy* in *Scotland*, you will leave no *Episcopacy* there, but what is already tolerated by Law, (*viz.*) By the 22d Act, the first Parliament of *WILLIAM and MARY*, which Ordain'd, *That all those* Episcopal *Ministers, who would take the Oaths, should continue in their Churches*—— And there they remain to this Day, a Kind of Toleration much superiour to that in *England*, for these enjoy the *Presbyterian* Stipends and Manses——And in some of their Parishes the establish'd Church Ministers preach by them in Meeting-Houses to this Hour, as Mr. *Ponton* in *Kingborn*, and others; if the Church of *England* will not call this Toleration, they will find it hard to tell us what is Toleration.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THese are to certifie, That We *Catherine* and *Alice Nuson*, Sisters, in the Parish of *Cockley* near *Halsworth* in the County of *Suffolk*, were born into the World Blind, having Cataracts on Each of both our Eyes, to the great Grief and Affliction of our Parents; they being so discourag'd by all that saw us, and we living in utter Darkness till we attain'd to Womens Estates, that they almost despair'd of finding any Relief; till at length hearing of the many great and wonderful Cures of this Nature, as well as of others incident to the Eyes, perform'd by Sir *WILLIAM READ*, Her Majesty's OCULIST, in *Durham-Yard* in the *Strand*, *London*; we apply'd our selves to him, which produc'd that good Effect, that He couch'd Us both, and by the Blessing of GOD, restor'd both of Us to our perfect Sight. We therefore thought our selves oblig'd in Duty to GOD, and for the Benefit of our Fellow Creatures, to make this publick; as well as in Justice to the said Sir *WILLIAM READ*. All which is here attested by Us,

Catherine } *Nuson.*
Alice }

*** *NOTE*, Sir *WILLIAM READ* has lately found out a Medicine, that infallibly prevents Cataracts, and preserves the Sight in Old and Young.

Just